



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,235	08/26/2003	Ryoji Watanabe	116939	1746
25944	7590	01/20/2006		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER PAHNG, JASON Y	
			ART UNIT 3725	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/647,235

Applicant(s)

WATANABE ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Y. Pahng

Art Unit

3725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,11,13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,11,13 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 20, 2005 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to claim 1, lines 5 and 6, does the sensing unit or the paper include an electronic data storage device?

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3725

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, as well as can be understood, 2, 5, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Bennett et al. (US 6,758,392) and Colgate, Jr. (US 4,547,002).

With regard to claims 1, 2, and 5, Chang discloses substantially all of the claimed structure including:

1. a destroy process unit (1) that destroys data stored in an electronic data storage device of an image display member or a credit card;
2. a shredding process unit (20, 30) that shreds the image display member or a credit card; and
3. a sensing unit (14).

Chang discloses a sensing unit (14) to detect an image display unit, but does not disclose detecting an electronic data storage device or a control unit. In a closely related art, disclose detecting an electronic data storage device. In a closely related art, Bennett discloses a credit card destroy process unit with a sensor and controller capable of detecting an electronic data storage device in order to control the destruction (column 1, lines 28-39 and 62-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Chang with a sensor and controller capable of detecting an electronic data storage device in order to control the destruction, as taught by Bennett. Although Chang does not explicitly disclose a display

member comprising paper, Colgate is referenced to show that credit card may be made of either plastic or paper.

With regard to claim 6, Chang discloses an insertion port (12) wherein the destroy process unit (1 and including 15) is disposed closer to the insertion port (12) than the shredding process unit (20, 30).

With regard to claim 11, Chang discloses a sensor (13) which senses the presence of an image display member in order to control at least the shredding process.

Claims 4 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (US 6,676,050) in view of Bennett et al. (US 6,758,392) and Colgate, Jr. (US 4,547,002) as applied above, further in view of Abramson (US 4,931,770) and Matsumoto et al. (US 4,879,724). Claim 4 calls for at least one of electric or magnetic application, and claim 9 calls for electromagnetic wave to overwrite another data to destroy data. In a closely related art, Matsumoto discloses a rewritable optical disk memory system (column 1, lines 21-23) and therefore inherently discloses overwriting another data to in order to destroy data. In another closely related art, Abramson teaches that using abrasive, cutting, chemical, magnetic, or other suitable component adapted to destroy information on a disc is well known in the art (column 2, lines 30-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Chang (as modified) with a rewritable optical disk memory system in order to destroy data in a disc, as such is well known in the art and taught by Matsumoto and Abramson.

With regard to claim 7, the modified device of Chang is capable of shredding or applying electric field. Whether the image display unit is shredded first and electric field is applied later or electric field is applied first and shredded later is not relevant. How an apparatus is used is considered in a process claim and is not germane to the patentability of an apparatus claim.

Claim 8 does not add any further limitation to claim 4. The use of electric field claimed in claim 4 would inherently include application of voltage.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (US 6,676,050) in view of Bennett et al. (US 6,758,392) and Colgate, Jr. (US 4,547,002) as applied above, further in view of Bley (US 6,038,012). Claims 13 and 14 call for the electronic data storage device to comprise an IC chip. In a closely related art pertinent to the problem, Bley discloses an electronic data storage device comprising an IC chip (column 1, lines 56-58) in order to make a card to be a smart card. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Chang (as modified) with an electronic data storage device comprising an IC chip in order to make his card to be a smart card, as taught by Bley.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Conclusion**

Applicant's request for interview is acknowledged. As discussed on January 9, 2006 with Kentaro Higuchi, Applicant is invited to contact Examiner to set up an interview after reviewing this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Y. Pahng whose telephone number is 571 272 4522. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 7:00 PM, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571 272 4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JYP

  
DERRIS H. BANKS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700